

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Doucet (US 5,538,242). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Doucet in view of Dreyer (US 2002/0066648). Claims 4 and 5 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 7 and 9 are allowed.

Claims 1, 6 and 9 have been amended.

Claims 10 to 13 have been added.

Reconsideration of the application based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. 102(b) Rejections**

Claims 1, 2 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Doucet (US 5,538,242).

Doucet discloses a signature aiming device. The apparatus comprises “at least one lead in tape mechanism having a left lead in tape and left exit roller and a corresponding right lead in tape and exit roller , the right and left lead in tapes forming a signature passage for delivery of a signature; an arm for supporting the left exit roller , the left exit roller rotatably mounted on the arm about a left roller axis, the arm being moveable to move the left roller axis, so as to allow a change in the direction of the signature delivery.”  
(Col. 2, Lines 21 to 32).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “a tape transport system for printed products comprising:

    a tape having a tape width,  
    a pulley, the tape running over the pulley in a travel direction, the tape width being perpendicular to the travel direction, and  
    a lever arm supporting the pulley, the lever arm having a first side and a second side, the pulley having a first section disposed on the first side of the lever arm and a second section disposed on the second side of the lever arm, the first and second sections

supporting the tape so that the lever arm is within the tape width.” Support found in the specification paragraph [0022], Figure 2 and Figure 3, for example.

Doucet fails to teach or show “the pulley having a first section disposed on the first side of the lever arm and a second section disposed on the second side of the lever arm, the first and second sections supporting the tape so that the lever arm is within the tape width,” as recited in claim 1. The first side and second side asserted in the Office Action do not support the tape so that the lever arm is within the tape width. The tape width is perpendicular to the travel direction of the tape, as recited in claim 1.

Claim 6 has been amended to recite “a method for transporting printed products comprising:

rotating a tape for transporting the printed products, and  
passing the tape over a pulley on a lever arm in a travel direction, the lever arm having a first side and a second side, the pulley having a first section disposed on the first side of the lever arm and a second section disposed on the second side of the lever arm, the first and second sections supporting the tape so that the lever arm is within a width of the tape, the width being perpendicular to the travel direction.” Support found in the specification paragraph [0022], Figure 2 and Figure 3, for example.

Doucet fails to teach or show “the pulley having a first section disposed on the first side of the lever arm and a second section disposed on the second side of the lever arm, the first and second sections supporting the tape so that the lever arm is within a width of the tape, the width being perpendicular to the travel direction,” as recited in claim 6. As discussed above, the first side and second side asserted in the Office Action do not support the tape so that the lever arm is within the tape width. The tape width is perpendicular to the travel direction of the tape, as recited in claim 6.

Withdrawal of the rejection so claims 1, 2 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

#### 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Doucet in view of Dreyer (US 2002/0066648)

Doucet is discussed above.

Dreyer discloses a brake mechanism for a conveyor idler. "The conveyor idler is rotatably connected to an idler shaft by means of bearing assemblies which engage an inner surface of the conveyor idler and run on the idler shaft." (Page 3, Paragraph [0057]).

Claim 3 recites "the pulley includes a bearing with a rotatable inner race."

As asserted in the Office Action, Doucet fails to teach or show the bearing supporting the pulley. It would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Doucet and Dreyer. Furthermore, there is no motivation to modify Doucet in view of Dreyer because Dreyer teaches a braking mechanism for a conveyor and is not of the same art as the signature aiming device of Doucet.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) respectfully requested

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4 and 5 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Original claim 4 has been rewritten as new claim 12 in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim.

Original claim 5 has been rewritten as new claim 13 in dependent form, depending on the new independent base claim of 12.

Withdrawal of the objections to claims 4 and 5 is respectfully requested.

#### New Subject Matter

Claims 10 to 13 have been added. Support for claims 10 and 11 can be found in the specification paragraph [0022], Figure 2 and Figure 3, for example. Support for claim 12 can be found in claims 1 and 4, for example. Support for claim 13 can be found in claim 5, for example.

**CONCLUSION**

It is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

If any additional fees are deemed to be due at this time, the Assistant Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of the same to Deposit Account No. 50-0552.

Respectfully submitted,  
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 

William C. Gehris (Reg. No. 38,156)

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC  
485 Seventh Avenue, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10018  
(212) 736-1940